

0012466116













A L A R G E R  
C O N F U T A T I O N  
O F  
B I S H O P H A R E'S  
SYSTEM OF HEBREW METRE:  
IN A LETTER TO  
The Rev. Dr. EDWARDS;  
IN ANSWER TO  
His L A T I N E P I S T L E.

---

By ROBERT LOWTH, D.D.  
F. R. SS. LOND. and GOETTING.  
And Chaplain in Ordinary to HIS MAJESTY.

---

Αἰψά κε φυλοπιδὸς πελέλαι κορὸς ἀνθρώποισιν·  
Ὡς τε πλεῖσθην μὲν καλαμὴν χθονὶ χαλκὸς ἔχενεν,  
Ἀμῆλος δ' ὀλιγίστος. H O M.

---

L O N D O N :  
Printed for A. MILLAR in the STRAND, and J. DODSLEY  
in PALL-MALL.

---

MDCCLXVI.





PJ

477+

L95

# A L E T T E R

T O

T H E R E V. D R. E D W A R D S.

REVEREND SIR,

**W**HEN I first gave my opinion of the very learned and ingenious Bishop Hare's System of Hebrew Metre<sup>1</sup>, which my subject almost unavoidably led me to do; I supported that opinion with reasons, which, as you yourself are pleased to acknowledge<sup>2</sup>, merited some regard. In further support of it, I afterwards added a *Confutation* of the same System, in a different form, and by a different argument; which I then thought, and do still think, to be demonstrative. Both these arguments were drawn from general principles; which, if true, left no ground for the Bishop's System to stand upon. I did not trouble myself or my reader with a particular and scrupulous examination of all the several parts of the superstructure; which would have cost much time and pains to very little purpose, and to the great disgust of both. I expressly declined an under-

<sup>1</sup> De S. Poesi Hebræorum, Præl. III.

<sup>2</sup> EDWARDS, Prolegomena in Libros V. T. Poeticos, p. 85.

taking of this kind. I aimed at the very foundation of the whole building; and, I think, I overturned it from the bottom. In the Latin Epistle, therefore, which you have done me the honour publicly to address to me, I think you had no right to charge me with an artful dissimulation<sup>3</sup> in passing over many of Your arguments in silence. I never undertook to answer, or to examine, all, or indeed any, of Your arguments. All that I attempted, and professed to do, was to support, against One Objection of your's, what I had written before you ever published a word upon the subject: and even upon this head the whole of my argumentation was directed, as before, against Bishop Hare, and not against You. As for the contradictions, which you have pointed out, between some passages of the lectures and the confutation; as likewise the false representations, and disingenuous dealing, with which you have been pleased to charge me; I shall still keep the same silence, though, now you have made the discovery, it can no longer be called artful or cunning; nor will I offer any defence of myself in form. I shall only refer to the several passages<sup>4</sup> where you have pointed them out; that if any one thinks it worth

<sup>3</sup> Epist. p. 3.

<sup>4</sup> EDWARDS, *Epistola*, p. 2, 3. 38, 39. (Compare his *Prolegomena*, p. 27.) *Prolegomena*, p. 95. 99. 231, 232.

while,

while, he may see what grounds there are for these accusations, and with what truth and judgement they are laid before the public: and I shall freely submit my cause to the verdict of common candor and common sense.

As Prosody and Metre is a subject in itself exceedingly dry and unentertaining, and especially Hebrew Metre, which, I am afraid, is also very unedifying, and likely to recompense our trouble with little acquisition of knowledge; I had so much regard for my readers, as to take care to give them as little cause of disgust as possible. I determined to say only what I thought most to the purpose; and to say even that in as few words as I could. The first argument I endeavoured to express with as much brevity, as might be consistent with clearness: the Confutation I contrived to bring within the compass of four pages in *quarto*; and if it had threatened to run to double the number, I believe, for that very reason I should not have ventured upon it. But alas! with all my care I have not been able to avoid, what I so much apprehended; you complain, and you several times repeat your complaint, 'that I fatigue you, that I make you sick to death. I flatter myself, that your stomach

<sup>2</sup> See De S. Poesi Hebr. Prael. III.

<sup>6</sup> Epist. p. 2. 33, 34. 41, 42.

must be peculiarly delicate and fastidious : for upon examination I find, that the whole that I have written upon this subject makes but ten pages in *octavo*. But whatever you may feel, does it become You to utter this complaint ? I will not return the compliment in kind ; but I have read, indeed I have ! above three hundred pages of your's upon the same subject. Whenever I begin to exceed that number ; you may then perhaps be allowed to complain, and cry out, *Obe jam !* with some sort of decency. But till then, I really think, that you are obliged in common justice to give me a patient hearing : especially when I assure you, that what I now send you, was principally intended for your particular satisfaction, by placing before you in a clearer light, if I could possibly do it, some points that are in dispute between us.

And here I must beg leave to abide by my former method ; that of combating general and fundamental principles only, those upon which the whole cause rests, and, which removed, the whole must sink. Were I to undertake to confute every auxiliary argument, and to answer every incidental objection, there would be no end of it : I should much exceed the bounds above prescribed ; I should never hold out myself ; and what would become of You ? It is merely for your relief and my own, that I proceed thus : not  
out

out of an artful dissimulation, or with a design of declining the force of any argument, which I may pass over in silence. For should there be any such argument, among all that have been hitherto publicly advanced in support of this System, either by yourself or others, which, after having considered what I shall here say, you shall think of importance enough still to urge in defence of it; I declare myself ready to answer it, and in such a manner, as I am persuaded will be satisfactory to every unprejudiced person.

I must begin with a remark of your's which occurs pretty far in your Epistle; where you tell me<sup>7</sup>, that I have stumbled at the very threshold, and am mistaken in saying, that Bishop Hare has deduced the laws of his Metre from the CXIth Psalm. Let us turn to his book; let us see how this matter stands, and carefully trace his method of investigation. The Bishop sets out with exhibiting this Psalm<sup>8</sup>: let him call it an example, or a key, or whatever else he pleases; that is not material; let us see what he *does* with it. The periods of this Psalm, the verses, the syllables, are all determined; and the accents placed to mark out the metre. The Psalm thus ordered and adjusted, he immediately begins to reason upon it; to make his

<sup>7</sup> Epist. p. 15.

<sup>8</sup> HARE, Prolegomena in Psalmos, p. ii.

deductions, and to draw his conclusions, in the form, manner, and words following :  
 “ Hinc clare liquet : ” “ ex hoc Psalmo  
 “ liquet : ” “ ex hoc Psalmo constat : ”  
 “ hinc certissime constat : ” “ ex hoc  
 “ Psalmo clare constat : ” “ hinc sequitur : ”  
 “ ex versibus sexto & ultimo invicem  
 “ collatis liquet : ” “ in versu quinto ex  
 “ metro liquet : ” and so on. He <sup>1</sup> more-  
 over *confirms* his observations on the CXIth  
 Psalm, by the CXIIth, CXIIIth, and CXIVth  
 Psalms ; as they stand in his Book of Psalms,  
 divided and accented by himself in the same  
 manner. He <sup>2</sup> then retraces, as he says, his  
 own steps, and lays together in order the  
 principal conclusions, which he had before  
 drawn, all arising in the first place from the  
 CXIth Psalm ; for the three other Psalms  
 afford no new Canons of Metre ; they only  
 confirm those already drawn. Other conclu-  
 sions indeed are deduced from them, con-  
 cerning the reading, the pointing, and the  
 pronunciation. But it is from the afore-  
 mentioned conclusions, deduced from the  
 CXIth Psalm, and confirmed by the three  
 following Psalms, that he compiles his Ca-  
 nons or System of Metrical Laws, XI in

<sup>9</sup> HARE, Prolegomena in Psalmos, p. iv. vi. vii. viii.  
 xi. xii. xvii.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. xviii.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. xxvii.

number<sup>3</sup>. In explaining the Bishop's scheme you follow exactly the same method, and use the same terms; only somewhat heightened, and for the most part advanced to the superlative degree. Your account of the process is this: the<sup>4</sup> beginnings and endings of the several verses in this Alphabetical Psalm being certainly known, the learned Bishop afterwards found, that these verses were either Trochaics or Iambics; (how he found this out, and how it appears, that they are really Trochaics or Iambicks, we shall hereafter consider;) and moreover other matters also clearly appeared from this same Psalm, which particulars you introduce in manner and form following: “Ex hoc Psalmo illud quoque  
 “ liquido constabat:” “ex hoc Psalmo clari-  
 “ ssime liquebat:” “ex hoc Psalmo luculentissime patebat:” and this account of the particulars you sum up in your four principal canons; which four contain very nearly all of Bishop Hare's. You introduce them with these words: “En itaque quatuor præcipuos canones *ex hoc Psalmo collectos*  
 “ (Psalmorumque universorum auctoritate  
 “ firmatos) quibus quasi fundamentis metrica

<sup>3</sup> HARE, Prolegomena in Psalmos, p. xxvii, — xxxi.

<sup>4</sup> EDWARDS, Prolegom. Cap. II. See also his Preliminary Dissertation to his English Translation of the Psalms, p. 5,—8.

“ *Hariana nititur.*” <sup>5</sup> This is evidently the form of the process, as it is laid before us both in the Bishop’s Prolegomena, and in Your’s. The CXIth Psalm is proposed, ready divided into periods and verses, the verses scanned, the syllables accented; you both reason upon it, and draw conclusions from it, as from a matter perfectly well established, and settled beyond all doubt, in all its parts; and these conclusions you afterwards collect together into a body of Metrical Laws. And this was the very account that I gave of it: my words were these; “ *Proponitur ‘ Psalmus ‘ CXI<sup>mus</sup> in versiculos distributus, et accentibus notatus, unde deducendæ sunt leges Metricæ Hebrææ.*” Be pleased to observe also, that I did not dissemble the Bishop’s plea, by which he claims the benefit of the confirmation, which his laws receive from the whole Book of Psalms. I gave it

<sup>5</sup> So likewise in the Preliminary Dissertation: “ Thus, “ from this CXIth Psalm, Bishop *Hare* discovered the four “ principal parts of his hypothesis.” — “ The truth and “ certainty then of this hypothesis seems sufficiently to “ appear from the abovementioned CXIth Psalm.” p. 8, 9. “ What has been hitherto offered in favour of Bishop *Hare*’s discovery will, I hope, in some measure “ shew it to be rational and well grounded. But as this “ has been entirely drawn from *one* of the Alphabetical “ Psalms, it may not be improper to lay before the reader some of those, which are not Alphabetical ones, as “ they will greatly *strengthen and confirm what has been already advanced.*” p. 19.

‘ *Metricæ Harianæ Brevis Confutatio, not. ult.*

nearly



nearly in his own words, which are these:  
 “ Hæc ’ autem quæ dixi vera esse, ut sunt  
 “ verissima, constat exemplis hic adductis;  
 “ et cuivis Psalmos inspicienti facile liquebit,  
 “ cum quavis fere pagina exempla legenti  
 “ in oculos incurrent.” And I gave an answer to it; the propriety of which, I hope, before I have done, fully to justify.

Having cleared myself from the charge of misrepresentation, I proceed to inquire more exactly into the Bishop’s method of reasoning; to trace his steps closely and warily; to place his system in a fuller light, than he has been pleased to afford to it; and to lay open the whole foundations of it, which in his *Prolegomena* seem to be rather withdrawn from the reader’s observation.

At the very entrance of the *Prolegomena* the CXIth Psalm is immediately exhibited to our view, divided, scanned, accented, all in due form. By what authority all this is done; and what proof there is, that it is truly and rightly done, we are not yet informed. The proof certainly does not precede the Psalm: we are to suppose, that it will in due time follow, and be communicated to us at last: and in the mean while we must be content to take it upon trust, that it is truly and rightly divided, scanned, and accented. The first observation that the

<sup>7</sup> HARE, *Prolegom.* p. xxxi.

Bishop makes upon the Psalm is, ' ' That  
 ' it is an Alphabetical Psalm, the several let-  
 ' ters of the Alphabet, each letter in its order,  
 ' beginning the several verses; which marks  
 ' the limits of the verses, their beginnings  
 ' and endings; so that we cannot be mi-  
 ' staken in dividing them, in making any of  
 ' them longer or shorter than they ought to  
 ' be. The Psalm therefore, as there given,  
 ' is rightly divided into its verses.' We rea-  
 dily admit it: the argument is unexceptiona-  
 ble. Again, ' The <sup>9</sup> word *Hallelujah*, as it  
 ' stands by itself, before the initial letter *Aleph*,  
 ' with which the first verse begins, does not  
 ' belong to the verse.' Very right; the proof  
 is satisfactory; we allow it. The author  
 proceeds: " In <sup>1</sup> this Psalm the periods are  
 " in number ten; the first eight of which  
 " are distichs, the two last are triplets:  
 " ——— for it is manifest, both from the me-  
 " tre, as I shall presently shew, and from  
 " the sense, that the two last periods cannot  
 " be divided into three." There is nothing  
 in this conclusion, considered in itself, that  
 appears improbable: on the contrary, the  
 sense, as it is here alledged, seems rather to  
 recommend it to our favour, and inclines us  
 to acquiesce in it.

<sup>8</sup> HARE, Prolegom. p. iii.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. p. iv.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. iv. v.

We have hitherto been led on fairly and openly: we have had all the satisfaction, which we could demand, in the two first instances; two undeniable proofs, of the right division of the verses, and of the exclusion of *Hallelujah* from making part of the first verse. And something probable is now offered from the sense in favour of the division of the two last periods; and further satisfaction is promised from the metre.

But here we must be upon our guard: at this very place the imposition commences; and if we take a step further without due caution, we may not easily be able to recover ourselves. The truth of the division of the two last periods is to be proved, it seems, from the metre. But the metre itself is not yet proved: it was laid down at first without proof: not a syllable has yet been advanced in proof of it: how then can any thing be proved from it? Should a mathematician in the course of a demonstration refer, for proof of some step in his reasoning, to a theorem, which he had not yet demonstrated; his demonstration would turn out at last no demonstration at all. But let us see, what this promised proof is, and in what manner it is given. We come to it in the next page<sup>2</sup>; and it is to this effect: "It is plain from this Psalm, that it is not necessary, that all the periods of the same

<sup>2</sup> HARE, Prolegom. p. vi.

poem should be of the same kind of metre: for here the first, sixth, eighth, and tenth, are plainly of one kind, but the rest of another. The former may not undeservedly be called Trochaics; the rest Iambics. For in the former the accent is to be placed on the first syllable, that the verse may have a right cadence; but in the rest an acute accent is to be placed on the second syllable; as the reader will easily perceive by the accents here placed. From this Psalm it is certain, that the verses of the same period ought to be of the same kind; namely, in distichs both the verses are either Trochaics or Iambics.—The same thing is observed in periods consisting of three members, as it is plain from the two last periods of this Psalm, in both of which all the verses are of the same kind.—From <sup>3</sup> what has been said it clearly appears, that the two last periods of this Psalm are rightly constituted, and ought not to be divided into three distichs; for the last verse of the ninth period is an Iambic, and the first of the tenth a Trochaic.”

Every single proposition of this argument is advanced without any authority whatever, other than that of the Psalm above-mentioned, as it is divided, scanned, and accented, at the editor's pleasure, and laid down with-

<sup>3</sup> HARE, Prolegom. p. vii.

out any proof at all of its being rightly done : and the whole, and every part of it, being deduced as a consequence from a mere arbitrary supposition, in no one part proved, except the division of the verses, and the exclusion of *Hallelujah*, in many parts not even probable, cannot itself pretend to any higher degree of certainty.

It is indeed astonishing, that the learned author should think he would be quit of his promise at this rate. The thing which he promised to prove was this : that the two last periods of the CXlth Psalm were rightly constituted, in being divided into two triplets, and not into three distichs. And how does he prove it? Even thus : The several verses in the same period *ought to be* of the same kind ; for they *are* so in this Psalm. In this Psalm the two last periods *are* rightly divided ; for verses of the same period *ought to be* of the same kind ; which here they would not be, if the periods were divided otherwise. Each of these two propositions ; namely, verses of the same period *ought to be* of the same kind ; and, this Psalm *is* rightly divided into periods ; is in its turn assumed : and each of them in its turn, in the compass of a single page, is urged as the proof, and deduced as the consequence, of the other.

The

'The argumentation from hence forward to the constitution of the Canons <sup>4</sup> is wholly of the same kind (excepting only the VIth section<sup>5</sup>, which confutes the hypothesis of Le Clerc), all deduced from the CXIth Psalm, as adjusted in the very entrance of the Prolegomena; and from the CXIIth, CXIIIth, and CXIVth Psalms, as adjusted in like manner at the editor's pleasure in the book itself. These three latter Psalms, called in to aid and support the former, do not make the least alteration in the case. The proof, that they are rightly divided, scanned, and accented, is still wanted. We do not complain of a deficiency of quantity in Psalm CXI, but of a deficiency of proof. If it were four times as long, it would be just the same thing: add yet another, and yet another Psalm; add the whole Book of Psalms, even though it contained fifteen hundred instead of a hundred and fifty, divided, scanned, and accented, in like form and manner; we are still but just where we were, till it be demonstrated, that they are thus rightly divided, scanned, and accented, according to the genuine laws of metre, the quantity of syllables, and the true pronunciation and cadence of verse, among the antient Hebrews. Suppose Gomarus, Meibomius, and Le Clerc,

<sup>4</sup> HARE, Prolegom. p. xxvii.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. viii. — xi.

had pursued their several schemes; and had divided, accented, scanned, rhymed, the whole Book of Psalms, as no doubt they could have done, according to the specimens which they have severally given: would this have been a proof of the truth of each of their systems? or rather, would not this single proof of the truth of each have been a demonstration of the falsity of them all; of all at least but one?

But it may be imagined, that the author chose to proceed in this method for the easier explanation of his System; and only intended, that we should give him credit awhile for the truth of his scanſion, till he should give us the demonstration of it in a more convenient place. Now I beg to know, where he has done this: turn to the Prolegomena; find out the place, and be so good as to point out to me the demonstration. I profess I have searched for it in vain. Having deduced and formed his Canons of Metre, in the manner already explained; as if his business were quite done, and his System established beyond all contradiction, the author now proceeds to give an account of the ill success of others in the like attempt and of the causes of it; and then passes on to other matters, not necessarily connected with the present question, which he never resumes. In his notes he perpetually argues from his Metre in the same manner, as a thing already perfect-

ly established. In short, the great *desideratum* is no where to be found : the verity of the scanſion of the CXIth Pfalm is left juſt as it ſtood in the entrance of the Prolegomena; and ſo likewise, the diviſion, ſcanſion, and accentuation of all the reſt of the Pfalms in the Biſhop's edition, is left naked and deſtitute of demonſtration, of all colour or ſhadow of proof whatſoever.

This is a begging of the queſtion ſo groſs and palpable, that, though I only give an account of a matter of fact, about which every one may be ſatiſfied by examining the Book itſelf, yet I am apprehenſive it may admit of ſome doubt merely from the improbability of the thing. How is it poſſible, may it be asked, that a perſon ſo ingenious, ſo learned, and ſo acute, as Biſhop Hare certainly was, ſhould ſo impoſe, either upon himſelf, or others? I do not know how to account for it, but from the ſtrength of prejudice, which a ſpecious Hypotheſis carries along with it; when it happens to ſtrike the imagination, and by pleaſing the fancy inſinuates itſelf into the approbation of the judgement. This once effected, it takes faſt hold of a man's mind; it poſſeſſes him intirely: he can neither hear, nor ſee, nor underſtand any thing that thwarts his System; and there is no camel of an abſurdity, which he cannot ſwallow with eaſe. This perhaps  
might



might be sufficient to satisfy other people, and to induce them to inform themselves, whether the case be really, as I represent it, or not. But what shall I say to You, Sir; who, I perceive, are actually inclosed within the magic circle, and are under the very wand of this enchantress? It is a desperate attempt: however I will try, whether I cannot dissolve the charm, and set you free. All I require is, that you would make some effort to open your eyes, while I endeavour to place the thing before you in another light.

The whole System of Bishop Hare consists of two distinct parts: one is the distribution of the Psalms into periods and verses, and the scansion and accenting of the verses; this, to avoid the multiplying of words, I shall call the New Metre: the other is, the settling of the pronounciation of the Hebrew, and the correction of the Masoretic Pointing; this I shall call the Reformed Punctuation. These two parts, though distinct in themselves, yet have here a necessary dependence upon one another: take away the New Metre, and the Reformed Punctuation, which is deduced from it, falls to the ground; take away the Reformed Punctuation, which introduces a different numeration of syllables, and the New Metre cannot subsist. If either of these parts were once firmly established upon a solid foundation; the other, by its con-

nexion with it, might be in some measure supported. If the New Metre were delivered to us upon sufficient authority, such as the express testimony of one of the antient Prophets, as David, suppose, or Isaiah, or Malachi; ( for I cannot admit of any later testimony upon this point: ) or by a Divine Revelation, such as Meibomius pretended to have received; ( a pretence highly impudent indeed and profane, but in other respects not injudicious, for by what other means could he come by his knowledge? ) a Revelation, I mean, well and duly attested: or if it were clearly investigated by reason and argument; ( any good argument not drawn from the Reformed Punctuation, for that is the thing sought in this case, and as yet supposed to be unknown: ) the New Metre, I say, being in any of these ways antecedently proved, and unquestionably established, the Reformed Punctuation might then be fairly deduced from it, in the manner in which we see it done in the Bishop's Prolegomena. On the other hand, if the Reformed Punctuation either were indubitably proved by deduction of reason and argument, ( supposing it capable of such proof; ) any argument, I mean, not drawn from the New Metre, for that is in this case the thing sought, and hitherto unknown: or were it confirmed by sufficient authority, such as the express testimony of one

one of the antient Prophets, raised from the dead, suppose, ( as Samuel is thought to have been by the Witch of Endor ) and speaking to us with an audible voice : or lastly, were it delivered to us by Divine Revelation ; the only method indeed, by which, as far as I can conceive, it is possible for us to arrive at the knowledge of it : the Reformed Punctuation being thus antecedently established, some parts, though not the whole, of the New Metre might from thence with some shew of probability be deduced. But as the case now stands, as neither of these parts, separately and independently of the other, is established on any such proof ; they are both of them mere creatures of the imagination, absolute fictions, void of all solidity or reality whatsoever.

To come to particulars ; let us examine the form and manner of the Bishop's reasoning in an example or two, brought forward, and fully displayed in open light.

Psalm CXI. Verse, or Line, 11th.

“ Cólh maysáv higgíd lezámno.”

This verse is marked and accented as a Trochaic. Why is it a Trochaic ? “ *Because* “ it consists of an even number of syllables.” How do you prove it to consist of an even number of syllables ? “ Thus ;

B 3

“ is

“ is one syllable ; *marsav* is two syllables ;  
 “ *biggid* is two ; *levammo* is three : in all eight  
 “ syllables.” Or shorter thus ; “ *marsav*”  
 ( the only doubtful word, suppose, as to the  
 number of syllables ) “ is a dissyllable ; there-  
 “ fore the 11th verse is a Trochaic.”

Now turn to Prolegomena, p. xvi. “ It  
 “ is plain from the 11th verse, that *marsav*  
 “ is a dissyllable.” How so ? “ Why be-  
 “ cause the verse is a Trochaic.” In other  
 words ; “ The 11th verse is a Trochaic ;  
 “ therefore *marsav* is a dissyllable.”

Again ; Psalm CXII. Verse, or Line, 17.

*pizzár nathán l'ebjónim.*

This verse stands as an Iambic. How do  
 you prove it to be an Iambic ? “ Because it  
 “ consists of an odd number of syllables.”  
 How do you make out the number of sylla-  
 bles ? “ Thus ; *pizzár* two syllables ; *nathan*  
 “ two ; *l'ebjonim* three ; in all seven syllables.”  
 Or shorter, thus ; “ *l'ebjonim*” ( the only  
 doubtful word ) “ is a trissyllable ; therefore  
 “ the 17th verse is an Iambic.”

Now turn to Prolegomena, p. xix. “ It  
 “ is plain from the Metre, that *l'ebjonim* is  
 “ to be read as a trissyllable.” How so ?  
 “ Why, because the verse is an Iambic.”  
 That is, in another order of words ; “ The  
 “ 17th verse is an Iambic ; therefore *l'ebjo-*  
 “ *nim* is a trissyllable.”

Thus

Thus the Reformed Punctuation proves the New Metre, and the New Metre proves the Reformed Punctuation: the cause is the effect, and the effect is the cause: a disputation in a circle, from which no valid conclusion can be drawn, except that of the futility of the hypothesis, which is built upon it.

The proof of the kind of verse from the number of syllables is never drawn out in full form, and unfolded, as I have done it in the examples above given: but the reason is always implied; and it arises from the IVth and Vth Canons: which are themselves assumed, as I shall hereafter shew, without the least proof, or even probability, whatever. But the proof of the number of syllables from the kind of verse lies open<sup>6</sup>. Hence if we take a general view of the System, as it stands in the Prolegomena, the apparent form of it is such, as I have before represented it: that is, the New Metre only seems to be taken for granted, and the Reformed Punctuation to be deduced from it. But in truth, both the one, and the other are, each in its turn, equally taken for granted, without proof; and the whole argument,, conclusion as well as premisses, is altogether a mere begging of the question.

<sup>6</sup> See Prolegom. p. xii. xvi. xvii. xviii. xix. &c.

Having shewn, that the truth of Bishop Hare's System of Hebrew Metre is not proved; I shall now proceed one step further, and shew, that it is in itself false and absurd, and utterly incapable of proof.

The Four <sup>7</sup> first Canons or Laws of Hebrew Metre, as the author has given them, are the Four Corner Stones of the whole Edifice. I shall try the strength of them; if they give way, the whole building falls to the ground. The rest, were the System true, are of very little importance.

I. "In this Poetry all the feet are dissyllables."

II. "No regard is had to the quantity of syllables:" or, "There <sup>8</sup> is no difference of long and short syllables."

The former of these propositions is deduced as a consequence of the latter <sup>9</sup>: I shall take them both together into consideration.

The Bishop in his Prolegomena is very brief upon these two material articles, and affords us but very little light upon the sub-

<sup>7</sup> Note, that by the Four first Canons I mean Can. I. II. IV. and V. The III<sup>d</sup> is an insignificant proposition, which seems to have been numbered as one of the Canons in the Prolegomena, p. xxvii. by mistake.

<sup>8</sup> Prolegom. p. xii.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

ject. The whole that he says amounts to this: “ It ‘ clearly appears from this Psalm, “ that in the Hebrew Poetry no regard is “ had to the quantity of syllables. — Hence “ it follows, that all the feet in the Hebrew “ Poetry are dissyllables.” I should have thought the consequence much more obvious and just, if he had said: “ Hence it follows, “ that in the Hebrew Poetry there are no “ feet at all.” However he is going to clear up this matter; he subjoins a reason for it; a medium, by which he proves the consequence. “ For, says he, if there were any “ feet consisting of three syllables, the difference of short and long with regard to “ the middle syllable would necessarily take “ place in this, as well as in the Greek and “ Latin Poetry.” The argument in form must stand thus:

In all Poetry every trissyllable foot has the middle syllable of a determinate quantity; (that is, either long or short:)

But in the Hebrew Poetry there is no determinate quantity of syllables:

Therefore in the Hebrew Poetry there are no trissyllable feet.

I beg leave to borrow this curious argument; and to carry it one step further, where we shall find it to be equally conclusive.

\* Prolegom. p. xi. xii.

In all Languages every word of three syllables has the middle syllable of a determinate quantity<sup>2</sup>; (that is, pronounced either long or short:)

But in the Hebrew Language there is no determinate quantity of syllables:

Therefore in the Hebrew Language there are no words of three syllables.

So much for the Bishop's argumentation. You, Sir, are pleased to be more large on this head. You begin with it in your Epistle to me. I had intimated, that I supposed there was a manifest contradiction in Metre, in Iambic and Trochaic Feet and Verses, without difference of long and short syllables. I thought, that a hint was sufficient; and that there was no necessity of explaining at large, that as the very nature and essence of an Iambic Foot consisted in its being made up of two syllables, the first short, and the second long; and of a Trochaic Foot, the reverse, the first long, and the second short; therefore, where there was no difference of long and short syllables, there could be no Iambic and Trochaic Feet; and where there were no Iambic and Trochaic Feet, there

<sup>2</sup> Common syllables are very few in any language; but they belong properly to Poetry only, and are indeed a Poetic Licence. "Nam versuum *propria* conditio est; " *ideoque* in his quædam etiam [syllabæ] *communes*." QUINTIL. ix. 4.

could



could be no Iambic and Trochaic Verses : and that to talk of Metre without long and short syllables, was like talking of an army without men, a fleet without ships, and a grove without trees. However You seem not to be apprehensive of any difficulty in this affair ; and tell me, that <sup>3</sup> if I do not understand, what Metre is without difference of long and short syllables, I must acknowledge, that I know nothing of English Metre. This I cannot quite allow : as an Englishman, one of the many, who has read a good deal of English Poetry, and has a tolerably good ear, I must assert my right of giving my judgment on this subject ; and therefore shall presume to examine what You have said upon it.

You acknowledge, that <sup>4</sup> we have verses, which exactly answer to certain Metres of the Greeks and Latins ; but yet, that this difference of long and short syllables is not observed, nor can be observed, in our language, whose nature is such, that it cannot admit of it. This, you say, every one knows, and that it is too manifest to be denied. You are too apt to follow your Author's example, in taking for granted what ought to be proved. What you affirm, concerning the nature of

<sup>3</sup> Epist. p. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 5.

our language, is so far from being self-evident, that every one, who knows any thing of the matter, cannot but know the contrary to be true.

Let us consider your very first example of English Verse.

“ He sūng and hēll consented ;  
 “ Stern Próserpine relénted.”

You say, these are very like, and exactly answer, to the Anacreontic Metres : as,

Θῆλῶ λέγειν Ἀτρεΐδης,  
 Θῆλῶ δ᾽ Ἐκδιδόν ᾠδεῖν.

And why, I beg to know, are they not as properly and absolutely Iambic Verses as those of Anacreon ? Why is not *hě sūng* as truly and properly an Iambic Foot as Θῆλῶ ? *and hēll*, as λέγειν ? You very <sup>s</sup> properly distinguish between the Rules by which the quantity of syllables in Greek and Latin, and those by which the *accent* (you could not consistently with your Hypothesis say, the *quantity*) in English, is determined : and yet you will perhaps tell me, that though *and* is long by position, nevertheless it here obtains the place due to a short syllable ; and so of the rest : for this is the Bishop's language, and you follow it by saying, that such syllables *may be accounted*

<sup>s</sup> Ffist. p. 6.

*short*, and others *may in a certain manner be taken for long*; as if they were not really so. Now I say, that *and*, as a particle without emphasis, is naturally short; and the same is to be said of the pronoun *he*: that the first in *consented* is short, and more determinately so than the first in *Alceidas*; this may be long, but that cannot: that *stern* is long, as the first syllable is in the line of Anacreon next to those you have quoted: that the middle syllable in *Proserpine* is necessarily short according to the English pronunciation; though the same syllable in *Proserpina* according to the Latin form, and even in *Proserpine* \* according to the Latin pronunciation, be necessarily long: that Position in English does not always, nor even generally make a syllable long; that even in Greek and Latin it is far from being a general rule; that in Greek there is a multitude of exceptions from it'; and for the Latin I refer you to Hare De Metris Comicis, p. LIX, &c. I will not be

\* See MILTON, Parad. Lost, Book IV. 269.

' See Dr. CLARKE'S Note to HOMER'S Iliad. II. 537. To the examples there given add ὄγχνη, Odyss. xxiv. 246. ἀνδρόης, Iliad. XVI. 857. συγγαμβρος, Euripid. Phœniss. 431. ἀμπλακημάλα, Æschyl. Eumenid. 937. in all which a vowel is made short even before Three Consonants. The Critics indeed in most of these places raise doubts concerning the genuineness of the reading, rather from the difficulty arising in regard to the quantity, than from any other valid reason.

answerable for his being right in all his examples : but I need not trouble myself about that ; *ipse dixit* ; and I dare say, You will not question his authority. I might add, that <sup>8</sup> in Greek and Latin there are degrees of long and short syllables ; that there are syllables still longer than long syllables, and still shorter than short syllables ; and therefore, that neither all long syllables, nor all short syllables, are equal to one another in quantity ; so far is quantity even in these languages from being of an absolutely determinate nature : and lastly, that in English perhaps there is no certain limit fixt by nature to determine, what degree of position is sufficient to make a syllable absolutely and necessarily long in verse.

In the same manner you<sup>9</sup> compare some English Verses with some antient Trochaics ; and say, that one might not without reason affirm of the former, that they consist of Trochaic Feet, and that they ought to be ranked in the number of Trochaic Metres. You seem to argue with me, as if I denied it : on the contrary, I affirm more positively, than You dare to do, that they are really Trochaic Verses, and consist of real Trochaic Feet, as much as those of Anacreon. And as to Your

<sup>8</sup> DIONYS. HALICARN. De Structura Orat. Sect. XV.  
QUINTIL. IX. 4.

<sup>9</sup> Epist. p. 8.—10.

Hebrew Verses, which you produce, I am so far from denying them to be Trochaics and Iambics, supposing the pronunciation to be rightly noted, and the accents rightly placed, that I insist upon it, that they are really Trochaics and Iambics; and moreover that they consist of real Trochaic and Iambic feet; otherwise they could not be, nor reasonably be called, Trochaics and Iambics. Whenever you talk of this matter, you speak, after the example of your author, with great reserve and caution: your Verses are *non immerito to be accounted* Trochaics and Iambics; and your syllables may *quodammodo be taken for* long or short. Like the substance of Epicurus's Gods <sup>1</sup>, “ non est corpus, sed *quasi* corpus; non sanguis, sed “ *tanquam* sanguis:” they are not Trochaics, but *as it were* Trochaics; nor Iambics, but *as one may so say* Iambics. “ Mirabile “ videtur, quod non riserit Epicureus, cum “ Epicureum videret: hoc mirabilius, quod “ vos inter vos risum tenere possitis.” There is something at the bottom of this management: I fancy, I shall discover the whole secret by and by. But whatever your design may be, your reasoning wholly depends, on this supposition, that <sup>2</sup> the modern Lan-

<sup>1</sup> CICERO De Nat. Deor. Lib. I. 26.

<sup>2</sup> “ Omnium hodiernarum linguarum, quatenus de syllabarum quantitate agitur, eadem est ratio quæ guages,

guages, English, French, Spanish, Italian, &c. admit not a difference of long and short syllables; that therefore the Hebrew may have been of the same nature in this respect. At present therefore I shall pursue this subject a little further.

Now, Sir, as You have very well observed, and proved it by twenty quotations, that the ear is the sole judge of numbers or metrical sounds; and as You have so good an ear, as to be able to judge perfectly well of the sound of Hebrew Verses, not one single verse of which language, rightly pronounced, you have ever yet heard, or can possibly ever hear: what can I do better than appeal to your ear? Your ear must surely be a still better judge of English Verse: this you can rightly express, and commit to your ear, by your own voice. For “though the ear” (says Longinus<sup>3</sup> as you quote him) “be the judge, the voice  
“ must set it in order: for as the voice ex-  
“ tending and contracting the sound of the  
“ well-modulated rythme formeth the sylla-

“ *Hebraicæ: nempe ita comparatæ sunt, ut brevium et  
“ longarum discrimen—respuant atque repudient.*” EDWARDS, *Prolegom.* p. 134. “ *Ex hoc Psalmo clare constat, nullam in Poesi Hebr. quantitatis syllabarum rationem haberi:—quod et hodie obtinet in omnibus, nisi fallor, Europæis linguis.*” HARE, *Prolegom.* p. xi:

<sup>3</sup> In *Fragmentis*.

“ bles,

“ bles, so the ear receiveth it from thence,  
 “ and judgeth of it.” Now Longinus in  
 this case would certainly have required the  
 voice of a Native, and not of a Barbarian :  
 and if you had attended to the sense of this  
 second quotation of yours, you would have  
 seen, that all the rest of your quotations were  
 nothing to the purpose, and that this quota-  
 tion totally overturned all that you had been  
 endeavouring to establish.

I beg you then to try the several examples,  
 which you have produced, by your Voice and  
 Ear ; and to tell me, whether you do not find,  
 that Pope’s, or Dryden’s, or Milton’s, Trocha-  
 ics or Iambics, run as well, and strike the  
 ear, as to cadence, number, and accent, as  
 fully and distinctly, as those of Anacreon ? You  
 say yourself, that the Correspondent Verses  
 are exactly <sup>4</sup> alike, and perfectly fellows or  
 twins : whence then proceeds this exact like-  
 ness, which by your own account amounts as  
 near to an identity, as possible ? I should  
 think, from the likeness, or rather the same-  
 ness, of the cause : namely, that the English  
 Trochaic and Iambic Verses consist of Tro-  
 chaic and Iambic Feet, just as much as the  
 Greek do. But how can that possibly be, if  
 in English there be no difference of long  
 and short syllables ?

<sup>4</sup> Epist. p. 11.

I beg you to try likewise some examples of another kind.

- “ 'Tis ' her crime to be lov'd ;
- “ 'Tis her crime to have charms.
- “ Let us fly ; let us fly :
- “ She shall die ; she shall die :
- “ In my rage shall be seen
- “ The revenge of a Queen.”

Can you find among the Greck Tragedians any Anapæstic Verses, that strike the ear more distinctly and forcibly, than these ? I say among the Greeks ; for among the Latins, (whose language, for an obvious reason<sup>6</sup>, is not so well suited to these numbers) I believe, you will search in vain. I will give you one example more in the same kind :

‘ See,<sup>7</sup> wild|as the winds,|to the de|sert he flies!’

which, if you please, you may resolve into Dactyls (for where there are Anapæsts, there must be Dactyls ; as where there are Iambics, there must be Trochees) thus :

<sup>5</sup> ADDISON's Rosamond.

<sup>6</sup> “ Quia [apud Latinos] ultima syllaba nec acuta unquam excitatur, nec flexa circumducitur ; sed in gravem, vel duas graves, cadit semper.” QUINCTIL. xii. 10.

<sup>7</sup> POPE's Ode on St. Cecilia.

“ See,



“ See, | wild as the | winds to the | desert he | flies ! ”

At least, the following are Daçtyls ; or, as perhaps you would have me say, and, as you cannot but own, something exceedingly like Daçtyls indeed, and which may not undeservedly be called so :

“ Merrily, <sup>8</sup> merrily, shall I live now,  
“ Under the blossom that hangs on the bough.”

And now, Sir, I must ask you, why you would deal so unfairly by us, as <sup>9</sup> to impose upon us the authority of Dr. Bentley in a case, in which you would not submit to it yourself ? For in the very same page, in which Dr. Bentley had said <sup>1</sup>, that the English Language admits not of daçtylic measures, (which you thought much to your purpose, as it might seem to imply, that it admits not of trissyllable feet) he gives two examples which are directly contrary to the point which you would establish. For to support the position of no quantity in English Metre, you are driven to the necessity of affirming, that <sup>2</sup> there are no trissyllable feet in English Verse. Now would you have us submit to the authority of

<sup>8</sup> SHAKESPEAR's *Tempest*.

<sup>9</sup> EDWARDS, *Prolegom.* p. 97.

<sup>1</sup> *De Metricis Terentianis*, p. x.

<sup>2</sup> *Epist.* p. 34, 35.

Dr. Bentley at the middle of the page, while you yourself reject the same authority lying directly before you at the bottom of the same page; where he gives examples of trissyllable feet, namely, Bacchiac and Cretic Feet, in English Verse? And pray, what need of having recourse to authority at all in this case? Cannot we read English, and have not we ears, as well as Dr. Bentley? Or, would you maintain, that there are no Anapæsts nor Dactyls in English, because Dr. Bentley says so; and believe him rather than your own senses?

In short, the state of the case, as it stands now in dispute between us, is, I think, this: my ear affirms positively, that in English there are real Trochees and Iambics, and also real feet of three syllables, even Anapæsts and Dactyls, whatever Dr. Bentley may say: and your ear, I believe, will allow, that there is something very exactly corresponding to them, and very like them.

But supposing there should be in English quantity of syllables, yet there remain many modern languages, by the example of which you may still maintain your position of no quantity in the Hebrew; as French, Italian, &c. As to this matter, I cannot trust either your judgment, or my own: though our ear may receive verses in those languages rightly modulated, and exactly delivered to it, by the voice of a Native; yet there is something very delicate in this affair, of which we must  
not

not pretend to be perfect judges. This is one of those cases, in which it is proper, and even necessary, to have recourse to authority: and it is not the authority of every Native, that will satisfy me in this point. It must be the authority of one perfectly well acquainted with his own language: a person of taste, of learning, and well versed in the polite world. Let us consider the French Language; and if we can find any such person to inform us of the nature of it in this respect, let us abide by his decision. I believe you will allow the Abbé D'Olivet of the French Academy to be such a person; one whose authority in this case is unquestionable. He has written a Treatise on this very subject, intitled, *De la Prosodie Française*. I shall only give you in short his decision, which is clear and full to the purpose. He makes Quantity one of the chief heads of his discourse, and gives a definition of it: “Troisièmement, on met plus ou  
 “ moins de tems à prononcer chaque syllabe,  
 “ en sorte que les unes sont censées longues,  
 “ et les autres brèves: et c'est ce qu'on ap-  
 “ pelle *Quantité*.” And he concludes his chapter on quantity thus: “On verra claire-  
 “ ment par-là, que nous pourrions nous faire  
 “ des règles de quantité aussi sûres, et réduites  
 “ à un aussi petit nombre, que celles du Grec  
 “ et du Latin.” Indeed Monsieur D'Olivet gives it as his opinion, just after the defini-

tion above quoted, that quantity is essential to every language : and I am persuaded, that you may as well endeavour to find out a language without vowels and consonants, as without long and short syllables.

Perhaps you may allow, that in these modern languages there is indeed a sort of quantity, something that may not undeservedly be called a difference of long and short syllables : but that it is not so determinate, so constant and regular, as in Greek and Latin ; that the same monosyllable is used sometimes as long, and sometimes as short ; and in words of many syllables, the syllables not accented are often dubious. But are the accents undeterminate, and the accented syllables dubious ? For nothing less than this will at all serve your purpose. You must introduce a total anarchy in accent as well as quantity, before you can in the least countenance your Hebrew Metre. Is it not *ǵávob*, and *ǵavób* ; *bécol*, and *be-cól* ; indifferently in almost every Psalm of the Bishop's scanning ? Do we not see *levólám*, and *levólam* ; *jéśarím*, and *jesárím* ; *vedóthecá*, and *védothéca* : *yábdecá*, and *yabdéca*, and so of many other words, with like variation, occurring perpetually, and even in the same Psalm ; for instance, the CXIXth Psalm ? Is this too justified by the example of the English poetry, or by that of any language that ever existed ? I urged this to you ; and you :

<sup>3</sup> Epist. p. 31.

quote upon me some verses of Milton, by way of answer. Are your Hebrew Trochees and Iambics then as determinate as Milton's English ones? Or does Milton vary the accent and quantity of the same word perpetually, as Bishop Hare does? If after these lines, which you quote,

“Thén to cóme in spíte of sórrow,  
“And át my wíndow bíd good-mórrów,”

Milton in the next page of his poem, had come with *sórrów* and *góod-mórrów*, would not you have thrown Milton and his poem out of the *wíndów*?

In short, you set out with a position absurd in itself, and true in no sense at all; that there is no difference of long and short syllables in the modern languages: you amuse us with this for some time by a vague and loose manner of talking about it. But when we come to apply this position to your practice, it will not, even in your own sense of it, in the least serve your purpose. An indiscriminate license of altering in verse both the accent and the quantity of words from their usual and established place and value in common discourse, was never allowed in any poetry of any language in the world.

So much for the two first Canons; no trifsyllable feet, and no difference of long

and short syllables, in Hebrew poetry. I proceed to the two next; and shall take them likewise both at the same time into consideration; for these too are intimately connected, and must stand or fall together.

\* IV. “When the number of syllables is even, the Verses of that kind may not undeservedly be taken for Trochaics, to be pronounced with an acute accent on the first syllable.”

V. “If the number of syllables be odd, they are to be esteemed Iambics, and the second syllable, that the rythme may be preserved, is to be made acute.”

Now, Sir, I am sorry to do it, but I must beg you to support yourself as well as you can, while I *repeat* what I said before upon this matter: only a few lines, I give you my word. I asked, ‘Whence is it certain, that, when the number of syllables is even, the verse is a Trochaic; when odd, an Iambic? Does it necessarily arise from the nature of the Trochaic and Iambic Verse? By no means; (for in the Trochaic and Iambic verses of the Greeks and Latins rather the contrary holds) but from the mere will and decree of the author. Why therefore may not I, or any one else, in this CXIth Psalm, or in any others whatever, place the accents

\* HARE, Prolegom. p. xxvii.

† Metricæ Hærianæ Brevis Confut. not. ult.

“ in a manner directly contrary, and turn  
 “ *Hare’s* Trochaics into Iambics, and his  
 “ Iambics into Trochaics ?” By <sup>6</sup> your answer  
 to me, you seem not to understand this. I  
 endeavoured to express my sense as shortly, as  
 possibly I could, to avoid giving disgust : this  
 perhaps has led me into obscurity. I will now  
 dilate it a little, and explain myself so fully,  
 that you shall not fail to comprehend my  
 meaning.

Bishop Hare’s Rule is this : count the num-  
 ber of syllables of which your verse consists ;  
 if the number be even, ( six, eight, or ten,  
 suppose, ) the Verse is a Trochaic ; if uneven,  
 ( five, seven, or nine, for example, ) it is an  
 Iambic. Now I ask, why not just the con-  
 trary ? why is not the Verse consisting of an  
 even number of syllables an Iambic ; and that  
 of an uneven, a Trochaic ? If the Bishop’s  
 Rule is a good one, and founded in reason, he  
 has left us to find out the reason, as we may ;  
 for he has not given the least hint of it. I  
 was casting about for it ; and considering,  
 whether there was any thing in the nature  
 of Trochaic and Iambic Verses, that deter-  
 mined one to an even, and the other to an  
 uneven, number of syllables. And as for the  
 nature of these Verses, how can one better  
 investigate it, than by examining it as it  
 appears in the writings of the Greek and

<sup>6</sup> Epist. p. 27—31.

Latin Poets, which give us the best and most perfect examples of the several kinds of them? Now I observed, that the practice of the Greek and Latin Poets, into which they were certainly led by the genius and nature of these Verses, was rather contrary to the Bishop's rule; their Trochaics oftener than otherwise consisting of an odd number of syllables, and their Iambics of an even number. And I beg you to observe, how tenderly and modestly I expressed myself upon this occasion: for in truth the case is thus, for much the greater part of all the Trochaics and Iambics of the Greek and Latin Poets that are extant. The Iambics and Trochaics, most commonly used by them beyond comparison, are the Trimeter Iambic, and the Trochaic Tetrameter Catalectic<sup>7</sup>: the former of which consists of an even number of syllables, and the latter of an odd number; the irregular feet in each, as Tribrachs, Dactyls, Anapæsts, being reckoned as two

<sup>7</sup> “Versus, quo *maxime gaudet* [Terentius] in Trochaico  
 “genere, quique jucundissime et summa cum venustate  
 “decurrit, una syllaba ab hoc deficit, inde dictus Tetra-  
 “meter Catalecticus: Latini Septenarium dixere.” HARE,  
 De Metris Comicis, p. xlix. “Accedo ab Iambicum  
 “Trimetrum, quem Latini Senarium dixere; versum lon-  
 “ge nobilissimum, et *omnium maxime* a scenicis poetis  
 “*frequentatum.*” Ibid. With regard to the Trochaic Tetrameter Catalectic, it is remarkable, that all the *extempore* verses of the Roman soldiers and of the mob, of which Suetonius gives many examples, are of that kind.

syllables,



syllables, as they represent dissyllable feet; otherwise it is to no purpose to talk at all of determining the even or odd number of syllables belonging to either. Or, to put this in another light, both Trimeter Iambics, and Tetrameter Catalectic Trochaics, end with an Iambic foot; which determines every regular Verse of the former kind to an even number of syllables, and every regular Verse of the latter kind to an odd number. And to what can it be ascribed, that Verses of both these kinds end in this manner, but to the harmony, the rythme, the cadence, that is, to the nature and genius, of these kinds of Verse?

The case is the same even in English. The Verses of the Iambic kind, most commonly used, and most universally prevailing, in our Poetry, are those consisting of four or five Iambics with single rhymes; and these have an even number of syllables. Of the Trochaic kind, the Dimeter Catalectic, of an odd number of syllables, is frequently used alone; the Dimeter Acatalectic, of an even number, is hardly ever used, without being alternately interchanged, or frequently, but irregularly, mixed with the other.

To make all this the more evident, I shall subjoin examples of the several kinds of Verse above mentioned, in Greek, Latin, and English.

I A M-

## I A M B I C S.

## TRIMETER :

Ω τέκνα, Καδμῦ τ' παλαινεα τροφῇ,  
 Τίνας ποθ' ἔδρας ταςδε μοι θοάζει  
 Ἰκλήριοις κλαδίσι ν' ἐξεσεμμένοι ;

“ Phaselus ille, quem videtis, hospites,  
 “ Ait fuisse navium celerrimus.”

“ Such was the sov'reign doom, and such the  
 “ will of Jove.”

## TRIMETER BRACHYCATALECTIC :

“ The wrath of Peleus' son, the direful  
 “ spring,  
 “ Of all the Grecian woes, O Goddesses,  
 “ sing.”

## DIMETER :

“ But come, thou Goddess fair and free,  
 “ In heav'n yclep'd Euphrosyne.”

All the foregoing are of an even number of  
 Syllables.

## T R O C H A I C S.

## TETRAMETER CATALECTIC :

Ω πάρος Θήβης ενοικοί, λεύσσετ', Οιδίπυος ὄδε,  
 Ὅς τα κλειν' αἰνῆματ' ἤδει, καὶ κραίης ὦ ἡν ἀνὴρ,  
 Εἰς ὅσον κλυδωνὰ δεινῆς συμφορᾶς ἐληλυθεν.

“ Cras

“ Cras amet qui nunqu’ amavit ; quiqu’  
“ amavit cras amet.

“ Ver novum, ver jam canorū ; vere natus  
“ orbis est.”

“ Lovely seems the moon’s fair lustre to  
“ the lost benighted swain,

“ When all silvery bright she rises, gilding  
“ mountain, grove, and plain :

“ But a thousand times more lovely to her  
“ longing lover’s sight,

“ Steals half-seen the beauteous maiden  
“ thro’ the glimmerings of the night.”

PERCY.

This seems to be the genuine form of the English Trochaic, in one line of seven Trochees and a long syllable. But now this kind of Trochaic in English is commonly divided into two lines, or verses ; which division was probably occasioned by the introduction of the rhyme in the middle :

“ Bred in plains, or born in vallies,  
“ Who would bid those scenes adieu ?

“ Stranger to the arts of malice,  
“ Who would ever courts pursue ?

“ Malice never taught to treasure,  
“ Censure never taught to bear,

“ Love is all the shepherd’s pleasure,  
“ Love is all the damsel’s care.”

SHENSTONE.

And

And the Greek and Latin Trochaics of this sort may be disposed just in the same manner ; for they generally have the Cæfura at the end of the fourth foot :

Ω πατρας Θηῆης ενοικοι,  
Λευοσετ', Οιδιπυς ἰδε.

“ Cras amat, qui nunqu’ amavit ;  
“ Quiqu’ amavit, cras amet.”

By this division of the long English Trochaic into two Verses, we have two sorts of Trochaic commonly used : one the Dimeter Acatæctic, consisting of four Trochees, making even syllables ; the other the Dimeter Catalectic consisting of three, and a long syllable, making uneven syllables. This latter is frequently used alone in Poems of some length ; of which many elegant examples may be seen in Mr. Merrick’s excellent Translation of the Psalms. But the other is hardly ever used alone ; and for this obvious reason : because the unvaried monotony of the cadence, if continued, would be extremely disgusting. And for the very same reason, Trochaics consisting of an even number of syllables were but little used by the Greeks and Latins.

It appears then upon inquiry into this matter, and on examination of Iambic and Trochaic verses, as practised by the Greek, Latin, and English Poets, that, in respect of the number of syllables, as even or odd, of  
which

which they consist, the Iambic verse is by its nature, genius, and cadence, much more inclined to consist of an even number of syllables, and the Trochaic on the contrary of an odd number of syllables, than otherwise. So that if Bishop Hare in forming his scheme of metre, had consulted the nature and genius of the Verses, of which he made his Hebrew Poetry to consist, and had been guided by them; he would have made both these Canons directly the reverse of what they are: his verses of an even number of syllables would have been, for the most part at least, Iambics; and his verses of an odd number of syllables, would have been, for the most part at least, Trochaics. And then then these two Canons would have been founded upon some sort of probability.

You see, therefore, that it was not without some reason that I asked, why I might not be allowed to turn Bishop Hare's Iambics into Trochaics, and his Trochaics into Iambics? which indeed, in my fictitious system of Hebrew metre, I had actually done in several instances in the CXIth Psalm; as,

Odéh javóh becól lebáb,  
 besód jefárim veyedáh.  
 gédolím mayasé javóh.

\* See *Metricæ Harianæ Brevis confutatio*.

And you now see, that I had some sort of reason for doing so, from the nature of the Iambic and Trochaic Verse. And further, I had authority for doing so from the Masoretic pointing, accenting, and pronunciation; which (excepting *jahvoh*, which is quite out of the question) are not altered by me in the above lines, but in one word only: whereas they are altered by Bishop Hare in every word but one. Moreover, the preposition *be*, occurring in each verse of the first distich, being, by<sup>9</sup> your own acknowledgment, really and truly short, nay very short; this circumstance alone determines that distich to be, as I have marked it, Iambic.

But perhaps, Sir, you may say, that I go upon quite a wrong principle in my pretended investigation of this matter: that the Bishop proceeded upon much better and surer grounds: he did not attempt to deduce his Canons of Iambic and Trochaic Verse from the nature of those verses, as it appears from the Greek, Latin, and English Poetry; or from the genius of those measures in themselves, always arbitrary and precarious, and varying with the differ-

<sup>9</sup> Preliminary Dissertation, p. 15. Prolegom. in Libb. Poeticos, p. 27. “ Fatendum sine dubio est, (neque enim “ verum dissimulabo) hasce syllabas [*be* & *ve*] semper “ breves fuisse.” And yet in his Epistle, p. 39. he says, that Bishop Hare denies this very thing; and this he proves by a quotation from Bishop Hare; which quotation indeed is nothing to the purpose, for which it is brought.

ent genius of nations and languages : he went a surer way to work ; he examined all the Psalms, and found experimentally, that the fact was really so ; that the verses of an even number of syllables were Trochaic ; and those of an odd number Iambic.

Now, Sir, I do take upon me to deny the certainty of this pretended matter of fact. Suppose I should affirm, that I have examined all the Psalms ; and that I have found the matter to be for the most part quite otherwise ; that the verses of even syllables are oftener than otherwise Iambics ; and those of odd, Trochaics : admitting, what is by no means certain, that the Hebrew Psalms do indeed consist of Trochaic and Iambic Verses ; who shall settle this dispute between us ? what is Bishop Hare's authority in this case ? I will be bold to say, not one jot better than mine : for surely I may presume to see full as well as the most sharp-sighted man that ever lived, when we are both alike in the same circumstances of absolute and inextricable darkness. It is a case, that cannot be resolved by any mortal upon earth : nor can I devise any method of getting it properly decided, but that, which I before proposed ; namely, having recourse to some Witch of Endor, who may assist us by raising from the dead one of the antient Prophets.

By this time, I hope, I have fully explained to you my meaning in the short question

or two, which I asked, concerning the two Canons of which we are treating: and you must excuse me, if I have been too large and diffuse in my explanation; for, as they stood before, I am sure you did not in the least comprehend what I meant, by your giving me answers so very cross to the purpose. One of my questions was, How is it certain, that, when the number of syllables is even, the verse is Trochaic; when odd, Iambic? You answer ' this by asking me, Whence is it certain, that this verse, for example, is a Trochaic?

“ Woods and groves are óf thy dréssing.” I answer, Not at all, as you would intimate, because it consists of an even number of syllables; for take away one of the syllables, it will still be a Trochaic;

“ Woods and groves are óf thy dréss :” but because, beginning from the first, it is accented on the odd syllables: and so of your example of the Iambic. Do not you see, that the verses consisting of an even or odd number of syllables, and their being accented on the even or odd syllables, which last is the only thing that determines them to be Trochaic or Iambic, are two things intirely distinct and different, and that have no kind of connection or relation to one another? I ask again, Does this (that is, the Trochaic's con-

' Epist. p. 28.



sisting of even syllables, and the Iambic of odd) necessarily arise from the nature of the Trochaic and Iambic Verse? Yes, you say<sup>2</sup>, it does: FOR Trochaic Verses are to be accented on the odd syllables, and Iambic on the even. The very same answer in effect, and just as wholly beside the purpose, as the foregoing.

I shall say no more of Bishop Hare's Four principal Canons: but after what I have said of them, I shall now venture to set them down, and to subjoin to them the Four principal Canons, which I opposed to them in my fictitious system.

I. " In the Hebrew Poetry the feet are all  
" dissyllables.

II. " There is no regard had to the quan-  
" tity of syllables.

III. " When the Number of syllables in  
" a verse is even, the verse is Trochaic.

IV. " When the number of syllables in a  
" verse is odd, the verse is Iambic."

From what I have said it appears, that every one of these propositions is not only destitute of proof, but even false, or in a great degree improbable.

My Four principal Canons are these.

I. " In the Hebrew Poetry the Feet are  
" not all dissyllables.

II. " Regard is always had to the quantity  
" of syllables.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

III. “ When the number of syllables in a  
 “ verse is even, the verse is oftener than other-  
 “ wise Iambic.

IV. “ When the number of syllables in  
 “ a verse is odd, the verse is oftener than  
 “ otherwise Trochaic.”

I only supposed, that these Propositions were equally clear and certain with the corresponding or opposite Propositions of Bishop Hare; and even on this supposition his system was demonstrated to be false. But from what I have now said, I believe, it appears, that these Propositions are in a good degree probable: and therefore that my fictitious system, though on the whole destitute of all proper foundation, in no one respect sufficiently proved, and in some respects certainly false, is nevertheless greatly preferable to that of Bishop Hare.

And here, Sir, I think, I might very well let this matter rest, and leave the Harian Metre from henceforth to maintain its ground, and to keep itself upon its feet, such as it hath, as it may. But as you say, I have dissembled some of your strongest arguments, I shall proceed a little further with you; and as far as I can guess what these weighty arguments are, I shall take them into consideration. But I must beg to be excused from carrying my remarks upon them as far as I might do; which perhaps would lead me into some  
 very

very minute and tedious disquisitions. I shall content myself with just pointing out their weak parts ; but in such a manner, as that any one conversant in these matters may be able to pursue them much further.

The argument, which you have urged, in favour of Bishop Hare's Metre, from the genius of the Hebrew Language, seems to be a favourite one with you : for you repeat it, and insist much upon it. I had urged, and, as you are pleased to allow, with some probability, that <sup>3</sup> as the Hebrew Language had now lain for above two thousand years absolutely dumb and destitute of its vowels, we cannot define with certainty either the number or the quantity of the syllables ; and as these are unknown, the Metre, which intirely depends on these, must be unknown also. You answer this by saying, that <sup>4</sup>, though the Hebrew Language be destitute of its vowels, yet the number of syllables may in doubtful words be certainly defined ; and as for the quantity, your metre has nothing to do with it. But let us hear the argument, as you have drawn it up in form : it is a Sorites ; and behold, here it comes !

“ The <sup>5</sup> *indoles* of the Hebrew Poetry being known, the true number of syllables

<sup>3</sup> De S. Poesi Hebr. Præl. III.

<sup>4</sup> EDWARDS, Preliminary Dissertation, p. 14, 18, 19.

<sup>5</sup> EDWARDS, Prolegom. in Libb. Poetic. p. 85, 86. Epist. p. 33.

“ in a very great number of words (*in quam plurimis vocibus*) will be known also :

“ And of what kind the *ratio* of the Hebrew Poetry is, you may certainly collect from the *ingenium* of the Hebrew Language :

“ And of what sort is the *ingenium* of the Hebrew Language, is sufficiently apparent from hence, that Metrical Verses cannot be written in it :

“ And that Metrical Verses cannot be written in it, is sufficiently clear from the multitude of long syllables, and the paucity of short ones ; that is, from the frequency of the consonants, as Le Clerc has demonstrated in his Dissertation on the Hebrew Poetry.”

You further confirm this in your Prolegomena<sup>6</sup> by the testimony of Isaac Vossius ; who observes, ‘ that the greater number of vowels there is in any language, the more perfect it is to be esteemed ; and the fewer, the more rude it will be, and the more unfit for Metrical Verses.’

Now I beg leave to ask, how you came to be so well informed as to your first principle, from which you deduce all this curious reasoning ? how did you investigate and find out the proportion, which the number of Vowels bore to that of the Consonants in the Hebrew

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

living Language? You set out with acknowledging, that the Vowels have been lost above these two thousand years ; you do not receive the doctrine of the Masorites as infallible ; no more did Le Clerc : by what rule therefore do you make this computation ? But Bishop Hare has corrected and reformed the Masoretical doctrine of the Vowel points. Does he pretend then to have restored to us the genuine Hebrew Vowels, and to have given us the true antient pronunciation of Hebrew, as far as it depends on the Vowels ? If he does, are we to take his word, and believe implicitly, that he has rightly and infallibly performed, what every man of common sense must know to be absolutely impossible for any mortal to perform ? Nay, what Bishop Hare himself has often in effect confessed to be now impossible<sup>7</sup>, and even to have been impossible for the Masorites to have performed many centuries ago ; though much better qualified, than he, or any one now can be, to do it, by the traditionary pronunciation delivered down to them in a continued succession from their ancestors ? But Bishop Hare himself does not pretend to so much : he expresses his doubts with regard to the

<sup>7</sup> See HARE, Prolegom. p. xliv. l. li. “ Nec profecto  
 “ in ulla lingua vera pronuntiandi ratio certò sciri potest,  
 “ nisi ab iis qui viva voce loquentes audierint eos, qui-  
 “ bus lingua, de qua agitur, fuerit vernacula.” HARE  
 de metris comicis, p. liv.

number of vowels, and the number of syllables, in many sorts and classes of words, which comprehend a considerable part of the language; and in particular with regard to two cases<sup>\*</sup>; which being left indeterminate and free to be used either way, as he does in reality leave them, he confesses it would be so enormous a licence, that the art of Hebrew Versification, very easy otherwise, would be rendered still so much more easy, as to become no art at all.

I am ashamed to spend so many words to prove to you, what you must be conscious of yourself: namely, that you do not know, what the true proportion was of the vowels to the Consonants in the genuine pronunciation of the Hebrew Language; nor even what it was nearly. You do not certainly know, but that some of the letters, (three or four of them) which we now take for Consonants, were really Vowels. There are great authorities<sup>b</sup> for this opinion; which, I believe, has never been effectually and altogether disproved. I will venture to add, that you do not certainly know, but that the proportion of the Vowels to the Consonants might be as great in the Hebrew, as it is in the Latin, and even in the Greek. You may

<sup>\*</sup> See HARE, Hebr. Psal. Addenda, p. 1—4. & Prolegom. p. xlvii, xlviii.

<sup>b</sup> ORIGEN, JEROM, CAPPELLUS, WALTON, SIMON, &c.

perhaps

perhaps think yourself sure in your negative here; but I shall exhibit to you an experiment, which may possibly stagger your faith.

The truest idea, which we can now get of the antient pronuntiation of Hebrew, is in all probability to be had from the remains of Origen's Hexapla. He has given us the expression of it in Greek Letters, according to the pronuntiation that obtained in his time. His authority in this case is greatly superior to that of the Masoretes, as he lived (according the opinion almost universally prevailing among the learned) many centuries before the Masoretes had completed their scheme of Punctuation: and the examples, which are preserved in those remains, are much more ample and satisfactory, than what we find in the Septuagint, where we have only the like expression of proper names. Here follow the three first verses of Genesis, expressed by Origen in Greek Letters.

1. Βρησιθ βαγα ελωειμ εθ ασαμαιμ ουεθ ααρες.
2. Ουααρες αιεθα θωου ουθου, Ουωσεχ αλ φνε θεωμ, ουρουη ελωειμ μαραιφεθ αλ φνε αμαιμ.
3. Ουιωμερ ελωειμ, ιει ωρ, ουιει ωρ.

Now in this piece of Hebrew, taken the first that offered, according to Origen, the Vowels are to the Consonants almost double in number, eighty-one to forty-five. I will let this argument rest here, till you shall produce an intire passage, of equal length,  
taken

taken at pleasure, from any Greek author, prose or verse, in which the number of the Vowels shall bear to that of the Consonants a greater proportion.

Another argument in support of the Harian Metre, and a favourite one too, I suppose, for it is frequently and confidently urged; arises from the evidence and testimony of antient Versions, and of parallel places; the coincidence of the sense with the Metre, and the great light thrown upon difficult passages by the help of the Metre: all which confirm and prove the truth of the Bishop's Hypothesis. Let us state this argument fairly, and see what it amounts to.

Bishop Hare has made a great number of alterations, and emendations, as they are called, in the Hebrew Text of the Psalms: some upon the authority of the antient Versions and parallel places, others merely conjectural, suggested by the sense, the grammar, the context, and some by the Metre alone. Now the whole of this evidence must be laid together, before we can form a proper judgment upon it, and proceed to a well-grounded conclusion. If the antient Versions, the parallel places, the context, the grammatical construction, some or more of them, sometimes give evidence in favour of the rectified Metre, the same witnesses, in conjunction with the Hebrew Text, at other times de-  
pose



pose directly against it. It is very unreasonable to expect, that we should be so partial to the metrical Hypothesis, as to consider only the favourable, and wholly to disregard the unfavourable part of the evidence. The fair and right way of proceeding is certainly to take both into consideration ; to weigh all circumstances ; to balance one part against another ; and to see the result of the whole. To set this matter in a clear light, I shall give a plain example of this process upon one of Bishop Hare's Psalms ; taking the first of them, that affords a sufficient number of emendations ; but in no other respect, that I know of, more proper for my purpose, than any other whatever ; and that shall be Psalm II. From this Psalm I shall produce all the alterations that are made, in which the new Metre is concerned, see whether the above witnesses depose for or against it, and fairly sum up the evidence.

Period 2. line 1. *vaijitjazzebu* : *vai* added for the sake of the Metre. The Hebrew Text, and the antient Versions, depose against this addition. The Editor says, the sense requires it : this witness, being cross examined, says no such thing. The evidence against the Metre.

Ibid. l. 3. *jab* for *jabvob* : no other evidence in this case, but the Hebrew Text ; and this against the Metre.

P. 3. l. 1. *et* struck out, for the sake of the Metre. The Hebrew Text against this omission : no other evidence appears. Against the Metre.

P. 8. l. 2. *baggoim*: *bag* added for the sake of the Metre. The Hebrew Text, and antient versions, against the addition : in particular the Greek Version, which has *εβγη* without the article; though the Greek idiom much inclined to admit it, and would certainly have done so, had the translators found it in their copies. Here the Editor summons in favour of the addition a parallel place, Pf. cxxxv. 12. (I suppose, it should be 15.) This witness upon examination has nothing to say to the point. Against the Metre.

P. 11. l. 1. *jab* for *jabvob*, as before. Against the Metre.

P. 12. l. 2. *Midderec*: *mid* added for the sake of the Metre. Greek and Latin Version, and the Construction, for the addition. I add likewise the Syriac Version. The evidence of the Hebrew Text set aside in this case. Evidence for the Metre.

Ibid. l. 4. *veashre*: *ve* added for the sake of the Metre. Hebrew Text, and antient versions, against the addition. The sense, called in in favour of the addition, hath nothing to depose. Against the Metre.

In Psalm II. the emendations having been examined, the evidence against the new Metre,

arising from thence, is to that for the new Metre, as six to one.

Now if you think, that upon examining the whole book of Psalms in this manner, the evidence of this kind will turn out in favour of the new Metre, contrary to what it has done in this one Psalm, you may try it, and let us know the result of your inquiry: if you think otherwise, or should find it upon trial even more unfavourable, you had better drop this argument, and never urge it again for the future.

I must observe here, that the Harian Metre depending intirely upon the even or odd number of syllables in each verse, it is but an even chance whether any given alteration, which the sense, the construction, the parallel places, or the antient Versions, may suggest, coincide with the Metre, or not; and though there should be no foundation at all for the Hypothesis, these testimonies may be expected to appear as often in favour of the Metre, as against it. But considering the licences allowed of in the Harian Metre, and the various ways of extending or contracting words, and making them of more or fewer syllables, and even of dividing the same word between different verses; the chances are much in favour of the Metre, and it is great odds, but any given reading may with a little management be accommodated to it, and any given emendation be set off so as to seem to countenance it.

it. This will moreover sufficiently account for the coincidence of the Hebrew Text of the Psalms with the Bishop's scheme, so far as it has succeeded, helped out with such a number of alterations as he has admitted. And it is very fairly to be presumed; that with the same licences, and the same liberty of alteration, any part of the Hebrew Bible may be accommodated and adjusted to the said Metre.

This objection has often been made; and ' it has been affirmed by those who have tried it, that the experiment has been attended with success. It has been answered on the other hand <sup>2</sup>, and that on experiment too, by a flat denial of the possibility of the thing. What remains in this case, but to put the thing to the trial, and to exhibit the experiment; which no one yet on either side has thought it proper, or worth while, to do. But first with regard to two conditions, which are insisted upon as necessary in this process; namely <sup>3</sup>, that the period be aptly divided, and the sentence be ended with the

<sup>1</sup> See EDWARDS, Prolegomena, p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> " Ausim affirmare, (quod etiam expertus loquor) plane *αδυνατον* esse, salvis principiis, quibus *Harrii* metrica nititur, ullum ex profaïcis veteris testamenti libris, (immo vel unicam periodum, aut comma) nedum ullum alium librum alia quavis lingua conscriptum, in versiculos metricè dividere." Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 113.

Verse ; it is to be observed, that if these conditions are necessary, there is at once an end of Bishop Hare's Scheme: at this rate perhaps half of his Trochaics and Iambics must be thrown out of his Psalter. The truth of the matter is; the most apparent and general Characteristic of the Hebrew Poetry is its being laid out into sentences nearly equal, and in some sort parallel; so that the limits of the Verses for the most part probably coincided with the pauses of the sentences. This is plainly seen in the Book of Job, and in the Proverbs, and in many of the Psalms. But it is not universal: there are many others of the Psalms, which are in the whole, or in part, very irregular in this respect: these cannot be reduced to Harian Metre upon the above mentioned conditions: Bishop Hare himself could not do it. The conditions therefore are not necessary upon his principles<sup>4</sup>: and it will be fully sufficient for the support of the above objection, and the success of the experiment, if any given part of the Hebrew Bible, confessedly prose, can be reduced to such Harian Metre, as may be justified by examples from the Harian

<sup>4</sup> “ Manifestum est — Singulos versus singulos sensus  
 “ non exponere. Quamvis plerumque verum sit, singulos  
 “ versus colon, vel saltem comma integrum conficere,  
 “ multis tamen exemplis liquet hoc non perpetuum esse,  
 “ nec sane ex rei natura esse potuit.” HARE, Prolegom.  
 p. xxxi. See also, p. xxi, xxii.

Psalms; to verses as well turned, as well divided, as regular, as elegant, as those of Hare generally are; with no more licences, or alterations of the Text, in adjusting them, than are usually admitted by the Bishop himself. And this I think any one may venture to undertake. The first trial I ever made of this kind was upon the passage that first came to hand; and without any difficulty it turned out as follows.

GENESIS I. 1 — 5.

1. Béref'it bará elóhim  
E't haššāmem v'et haárez,
2. V'haárez hájetáh tohú vebóhu,  
Véħošéc yal péne téhom:  
Verúħ elóhim méraħépet  
yal pené hamáim.
3. Vájomer elóhim;  
Jéhi ór, vihi ór.
4. Vájar élohím et háor,  
C'i tob; vájabdél elóhim  
Bén haór ubén haħošéc.
5. Vajikra élohím laór jom,  
Veláħošéc kará lel:  
Vihí yeréb, vihi bokér, jom éħad.

NOTE.

In this whole passage there is but one Letter altered. Period 5. line 2. for לילה  
*lailah,*

*lailab*, I read לַיִל *lel*. God, in giving a Name to the Darkness, it is presumed, would be represented by Moses in this place, as making use of the proper and original form of that Name, not the improper and irregular; *lel*, and not *lailab*: for in the latter, when used as a noun, being still masculine, the ה is paragogical, as the Grammarians inform us: see *Buxtorf's Lexicon*, *Schultens Instit. Ling. Heb.* p. 452. Besides, *lailab* is properly an adverb, (*Cocceii Lexicon*) *by night*, as *jomam* *by day*; (Deut. i. 33,) which latter also is used sometimes as a noun together with *lailab*: see Jer. xxxiii. 20, and 25. For the same reason therefore that *jomam* is not used, nor could properly be used, in the preceding line, it is to be presumed, that *lailab* could not be used in this. Reason and Grammar require this emendation, and the Metre confirms it. Note also, that לַיִל may be used in verse, either way; indifferently <sup>s</sup>, as a Monosyllable, or a Dissyllable.

The passage above given affords but little matter for conjectural criticism: and indeed the case is the same throughout the whole chapter; in which the Text is in the main pretty intire, and free from mistakes of importance. I shall therefore proceed no further here; but pass on to another place, the first likewise, which naturally offering itself, with-

<sup>s</sup> See EDWARDS, note on Ps. lii. 8.

out any particular search, seemed likely to afford us larger scope, and to give us an opportunity of displaying our criticism. We shall here shew, that our Hypothesis, of the Harian Metre universally prevailing through all parts of the Hebrew Bible, greatly conduces to the emendation of the Hebrew Text; and at the same time the emendation of the text will effectually recommend and establish our Hypothesis. But this, as a matter of no small importance, we shall enter upon with due solemnity; and shall endeavour to execute in proper form, manner, style, and language, to the perfect satisfaction of the learned.



EXODI CAPUT I.

I N

VERSICULOS METRICE divisum ;

E T

METRICES præcipue ope

Integritati suæ restitutum.

# E X O D I

## C A P U T I.

1. “ véelléh řemót bené iřráel,  
hábaím mizráimah :  
ét jaykób *abíhem*  
íř ubéto báu.
  
5. reubén, řimyon, leví, jehúdah ;  
iřáscar, zébulún, binjámín ;  
dan, vénaptáli ; gád, veářer :  
*vejósep hájah bémizráim.*

3. Hujusce Libri Metrico-Historici (quod genus scriptionis antiquissimis temporibus fuisse usurpatum testantur auctores gravissimi; quum non modo annales, sed & leges metro conditæ, rudium hominum memoriæ commendarentur:) hujus, inquam, voluminis primum comma in codice Hebræo est tricolon, duobus versiculis Trochaicis unoque insuper Iambico constans; hoc modo,

véelléh řemót bené iřráel  
hábaím mizráimah  
et jáykob íř ubéto báu :

contra canonem VII Metricæ Hebrææ. Hoccine ut in se flagitium admiserit cultissimus Vates in ipso operis limine? Credat qui volet, hoc à Mose profectum. In veros auctores culpa omnis recidat: scribas, dico, male feriatos, aut etiam dormitantes, qui post *jaykób* omiserunt vocem apposituissimam אֲבִיהֶם; ita enim in suo exemplari procul dubio scriptum legerunt LXX Interpretes, qui habent ἀπα Ἰακώβ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῶν: ita etiam legimus in locis similibus; אֲבִיהֶם יְיָ, Jos. xix. 47. Jud. xviii, 29. אֲפִרַּיִם אֲבִיהֶם 1 Chron. vii. 22. ubi post nomen patris solemniiter exprimitur paternitatis relatio, quanquam alias ex iis ipsis locis notissima, nec ullo modo necessaria. Sic tota periodus quatuor Trochaicis legitimis, iisque bene concinnis, constabit: simulque ope Metricæ, adilipulante Græca versione, locisque parallelis, loco depravato sua integritas restituitur.

## ספר שמות

## פרק א

1. ואלה שמות בני ישראל  
הבאים מצרימה  
את יעקב . . .  
איש וביתו באו:

2. ראובן שמעון לוי ויהודה:  
3. יששכר זבולון ובנימין:  
4. דן ונפתלי גר ואשר:

. . . . .

5. Codex Hebræus habet וִיהוּדָה, & similiter in versiculo sequente וּבְנִימִן; nomen nempe utrumque cum copula. Quod quanquam à metrica ratione non sit omnino alienum; quippe cum nihilominus eædem ipsæ voces levi opera, mutatis et inversis accentibus, ita notari possint, ut ex bonis Iambicis non mali fiant Trochaici; tamen cum, ut bene notat Harius, Trochaici rarius occurrant, & jam præcesserit integra Periodus quatuor Trochaicorum, visum est auctoritatem LXX Intt. sequi, qui neutro in loco copulam ׀ agnoscunt, & Iambos ejectos postliminio restituere. Hoc melius, et ex ipsa numerorum varietate concinnius, si quid sapiunt meæ auriculæ; quibus magistris ac ducibus in metrica Hebræa antiqua instauranda præcipue utor. Verum singulis nominibus in utroque versiculo copulam præponit Codex Samaritanus: quod perinde est; nam iterum, mutatis accentibus, in tres Trochaicos nullo negotio converti possunt; hoc modo:

reúben, véřimyón, velévi,  
víhudáh, vířáscar,  
vézebúlun, úbinjámin.

3. Ecce vero iterum supinam Librariorum negligentiam! Homines somnolenti, ac plane vecordes: qui hunc versiculum de propria sede deturbando, atque in alienam invehendo, et rerum ordinem et metrum miris modis pessumdederunt. Quid enim, quæso? Familiae Jacobi numerum recenset scriptor Poetico-His-

vihí col népeš józe jérec jávkob  
10. *hámifáb vešibrim nápeš.*

. . . . .

vajámat jósep vécol éhaiv,  
vé col hádor háhu.

úbené iſráel páru ;  
váifrezu, vajirbu :

15. vajávazmu beinéod méod,  
vatímallé haárez ótam.

vajakam mélec hádaš yál mizráim,  
ſeló jadáy et jósep.

toricus : filios numerat undecim, qui cum patre suo in Ægyptum migraverunt; quonam igitur in loco, nisi in hoc, mentionem porro faceret duodecimi, qui jam antea fuisset in Ægypto? Nonne expectaret lector Hebræus numeri illius duodenarii, inter ipsos tantopere celebrati, completionem *αμεσως* atque ante omnia faciendam? Ne itaque solemnisi Patriarcharum Catalogus imperfectus ac plane *μεινους* evaderet, erat hic subinjicienda Josephi mentio. Putasne item vatem nostrum in metrica Hebræa adeo fuisse rudem et indoctum, ut versus Iambicos et Trochaicos inscite misceret: duos poneret Iambicos, tum unicum Trochaicum; duos iterum Iambicos, et unicum Trochaicum? cujus ordinis exemplum frustra requires, cum nullam ejus fecerit mentionem magnus hujusce artis jamdudum deperditæ instaurator et *νομοθέτης* Harius! Apage a vate omnium *μυσικωτάτω* istiusmodi dedecus! Scribarum isthæc sunt facinora. Reduc in pristinam sedem tertium membrum commatis quinti, et subjunge commati quarto; jam sana et sincera, lucida et bene ordinata, concinna et numerosa, erunt omnia. Habes Periodum primam quatuor Trochaicis versiculis constantem; secundam, quatuor Iambicis; tertiam porro, ut mox ostendam, Iambicis et Trochaicis duobus alternantibus. Transpositioni autem istius membri adstipulatur versio LXX seniorum, hunc ordinem, autographo Moſis haud dubie consonum, ut ex Metro potissimum liquet, manifeste præ se ferens.

Vide autem quam scite ac belle hanc secundam Periodum interpunxerunt Masoretæ illi, criticorum, si diis placet, Coryphæi!

[ 71 ]

5. ויהי כל נפש יצאי ירך יעקב

שבעים נפש . . . .

ויוסף היה במצרים:

6. וימת יוסף וכל אחיו

וכל הדור ההוא:

7. ובני ישראל פרו

וישרצו וירבו

ויעצמו במאד מאד

ותמלא הארץ אתם:

8. ויקם מלך חדש על מצרים

אשר לא ידע את יוסף:

phæi! Tricolon, quod uno membro avulso ex Tetracolo scribæ confecerant, in tria Monocola, monstrum in Hebræa Poesi inauditum, per totidem *soph-pasukim* discindentes. Amove, fodes, ac furcillis ejice importunas istas interpunctiones; et membra inscite disjuncta in unam Periodum recollige. Suadet hoc, cum sententiæ et constructionis ratio, tum Metrorum inter se congruentia et æqualitas.

10. Quantas turbas inter Commentatores et Criticos excitaverit hic locus cum Act. vii. 14. collatus, quantumque æstuaverint in Propheta et Evangelista in concordiam reducendis, nemo est paulo in his literis versatior, qui nesciat. Adi modo Wolfii Curas Philologicas in Acta Apostolorum loco citato, qui plerorumque sententias dissentientes recenset; quibus auditis, dices fortasse cum Comico illo sene: "fecistis probe: incertior sum multo, quam dudum." Multi in Codd. Novi Testamenti, quasi hoc in loco depravatos, culpam rejiciunt: ubi pro *παις* legi volunt *παιδας*; ita Bertramus, Beza, Glassius; vel *παιως*, Jac. Cappelus: intoleranda audacia, contra constantem omnium MSS fidem et consensum. Ego unius Metricæ ope evincam, Lucæ locum sanum esse, itemque hoc in loco LXX Intt. Versionem, quæ cum Luca consentit; Mosis ipsius textum in mendo cubare: quod nunquam suspicati sunt Critici, crassa et pudenda metri Hebræi ignorantia præpediti. Vide enim, ut nunc se habet lectio Hebræi Codicis, quantopere laboret metrum:

vihí col népeš józe jérec jáykob

. . . . . šibym napeš:

vájomér el yámimo ;  
20. hínneh yám bené isráel  
rab vévazúm mimménnu ;  
habáh na, níthacmáh lo.

pén jirbéh, vehájah cí tikrénu  
mílhamáh, venófap gám hu  
25. val fónenu, venílham banu,  
verálah mín haárez.

vájafímu yálaiv fáre míssim,  
lémayán yanóto bésiblótam :  
vajíben yáre míscenót lepárvoh,  
30. et pítom, v'et ravámfes.

tum amoto ac transposito altero illo membro, quod superiori Periodo subjiendum modo demonstravi, sequitur,

vejámat jósep vécol éhaiv,  
vécol hádor háhu.

Sentis nimirum unam alteramque voculam e secundo versiculo excidisse, quæ ad supplendum versum Trochaicum, versiculo alterno sequenti respondentem, desiderantur : ipsas nimirum voces, quas LXX Intt. et Lucas in suo exemplari legerunt,

*hámifáb vešibyim nápeš.*

πεντε και εβδομηκοντα, LXX. εβδομηκοντα και πεντε, Lucas. Nota autem vocem **שׁוּב**, pro persona, masculino genere sæpiusculè venire : vid. Gen. xlv. 22, 25. et Jer. lii. 30. Hanc autem lectionem etiam historiæ veritas postulat. Recenset Moses Jacobi familiam, quæ una cum ipso in Ægyptum migravit. Quid vero ? nonne uxorum filiorum familias, quotquot erant superstites (nam numerus incertus est) habenda erat ratio ? An cuiquam persuaseris, Moſen in ea fuisse sententia, ut, cum barbaris quibusdam hodiernis, negaret mulieres animabus esse præditas, adeoque inter animas numerari non debuisse ? Dices fortasse, nurus Jacobi non posse censeri in illorum numero, qui e femore Jacobi processerunt. Vah ! quasi ita ad vivum refecanda esset Moſis locutio : nurus sunt filiarum familias, adeoque familiæ pars ; atque id solum voluit

9. ויאמר אל עמי  
הנה עם בני ישראל  
רב ועצום מכינו;  
10. הבה . . . נתחכמה לו

פן ירבה והיה כי תקראנה  
מלחמה ונוסף גם הוא  
על שנאינו ונלחם בנו  
ועלה מן הארץ:

11. וישימו עליו שרי מסים  
למען ענתו בסבלתם  
ויבן ערי מסכנות לפרעה  
את פתם ואת רעמסס:

voluit Moses. Quid? num Jacobus ipse ex suomet ipsius femore prodiit? Quod ut affirmes, æquè necesse est; nam certum est Jacobum in numero septuaginta personarum includi, si pro eo numero pugnas, ejusque veram rationem inire velis. Constat enim personas ex femore Jacobi revera egressas, quæ cum ipso in Ægyptum migraverunt, fuisse numero sexaginta sex: vide Gen. xli. 8—26. adde Josephum, duosque ejus filios, et Jacobum ipsum, numerum habes septuaginta. Sed Josephus, duoque ejus filii, erant prius in Ægypto, nec cum Jacobo in Ægyptum migraverunt; adeoque personis hic annumeratis accenseri non possunt. Itaque numero sexaginta sex adde novem nurus; (nam Judæ uxor in Cananæa jam ante decesserat, Gen. xxxviii. 12. et una præterea aliqua reliquarum;) jam habes numerum septuaginta quinque capitum familiæ Jacobi, quæ cum ipso in Ægyptum migravit. De locis autem vatis nostri huic parallelis bipis, Gen. xli. 27. Deut. x. 22. posthac videro, libros istos, in versiculos item dispositos, et Metricas ope integritati suæ restitutos, aliquando donaturus.

18. iſelo. “ Heb. aſer. Quod plene quidem ſcribitur; ſed “ metrum poſtulat, ut contracte legatur iſe, ut ſæpe alias.” Hæc in Pſalm i. verſic. 12.

22. Hæc in Periodo alicubi laborat metrum. Repoſui particulam ׁ in ultimo verſiculo; cujus veſtigium extat in verſione LXX

vecáašer jeyánnu óto,  
cen jírbeh, vécen jiproz ;  
vajákuzú mipné bené ísráel :

vajáybidú mizráim  
35. et bēne ísráel bepárec.

váimaráru ét ħajéhem,  
báyabódah kášah :

baĥómer úbilbénim,  
ubécol yábodáh bašádeh,  
40. veét col yábodátam,  
ašer yabdú bahém bepárec.

vájomér meléc mizráim  
lámejáldot háyibríjot,  
šēšēm haēĥat šíprah,  
45. vešēm hašénit púyah :

vájómer bėjallédcen háyibríjot,  
uréitén val háobnáim,  
im bēn hu, váhamíttēn óto,  
v'im bát hi, váĥajétah.

Intt. Exemplar. Vat. ΔΕΥΤΕ ΟΥΝ ΚΑΤΑΤΟΦΙΣΘΗΜΕΘΑ. Est et alia ratio  
iſthoc ulcuſculum ſanandi ; hoc modo :

vájomér el yámmo :  
hínneh yám bené ísráel,  
hámon ráb, vejayazóm mimménnu ;  
hábah níĥacmáh lo :

nimirum ſupplendo lacunas tertii verſiculi ex verſione Græca, quæ  
ſic habet ; *μεγα πληθος, και ισχυει υπερ ημας*. Sed prius placet ;  
ut minus recedens à textu Hebræo.



12. וכאשר יענו אתו  
כן ירבה וכן יפרץ  
ויקצו מפני בני ישראל:

13. ויעבדו מצרים  
את בני ישראל בפרך:

14. וימרו את חייהם  
בעבדה קשה

בחמר ובלבנים  
ובכל עבדה בשדה  
. . את כל עבדתם  
אשר עבדו בהם בפרך:

15. ויאמר מלך מצרים  
למילדת העברית  
אשר שם האחת שפרה  
ושם השנית פועה:

16. ויאמר בילדכן את העבריות  
וראיתן על האבנים  
אם בן הוא והמתן אתו  
ואם בת הוא והיה:

23. Tikrenu. Ita omnino legendum, cum Cod. Sam. LXX. Intt. et aliis compluribus veterum. Quod ad metrum attinet, nihil interest.

28. "Hebr. *limayan*, inquit Harius; sed dissyllabum esse "ubique occurrit, omnia exempla monstrant." Not. in Psalm. v. 18. Verum, quod pace tanti auctoris dixerim, hoc in loco est evidens exemplum in contrariam partem.

40. *veeth*. Ita MS. Erfurt. 3. (vide Bib. Heb. Michaelis) proculdubio recte: deest enim syllaba ad explendum versiculum.

46. Heb.

50. vatírená haméjaldót et háelóhim,  
veló yafú caáſer díbber  
élehen meléc mizráim,  
váteĥájená et hájeladim.

vajíkra *páryob* lámejáldot,  
55. vajómer láhen, máduy  
yáſitén hadábar házeh,  
váteĥájená et hájeládim.

vátomárna hámejáldot  
él pharyóh, ci ló canáſhim  
60. háميزrijot háyibrijot,  
cí ĥajót henáh, beťérem tábo  
élehen haméjalédet véjaládu.

vájæĥéb elóhim lámejáldot ;  
váireb háyam, vájavázmu méod.

46. Heb. *et* hayibrijot : sed omittenda est, metri gratia, particula *et* ; vel forsan, quod magis suspicor, vox *vajomer*, a librariis otiose et inutiliter repetita ab initio commatis præcedentis.

49. Vide modo, quam turpiter rursus hallucinati sunt oscitantes scribæ ; qui nobis hic exhibent *vaĥajah*, crasso errore, et manifesto solæcisino, pro *vaĥajetha*, quod habet Cod. Sam. quam lectionem, haud dubie sinceram, restituiamus. Metrum quod attinet, perinde erit, seu in eodem versiculo *v'im* legamus *μενοσυλλαβικως*, seu *yale* versiculo secundo ; ut hujus periodi secundus et quartus sint Trochaici. Prius prætulimus ; quoniam ne litterulam quidem in Textu facile mutamus sine codicum vel versionum antiquarum auctoritate, una vocula excepta, *ſe* pro *aſer*.

54. Pro *paryob* hoc in loco textus Hebræus habet *melec mizraim* ; incuria librariorum, qui e duabus locutionibus synonymis aliquoties recurrentibus unam pro altera, uti fit, posuerunt. Quorum errorem palam facit vel ipse contextus : nam postquam dixisset Moſes, “ Et accersivit PHARAO obſettrices ; ” addit, planè congrue ad priorem loquendi formam, “ Et responderunt obſettrices PHARAONI.”

17. ותיראן המילדת את האלהים  
ולא עשו כאשר דבר  
אליהן מלך מצרים  
ותחיין את הילדים:

18. ויקרא מלך מצרים למילדת  
ויאמר להן מדוע  
עשיתן הדבר הזה  
ותחיין את הילדים:

19. ותאמר המילדת  
אל פרעה כי לא כנשים  
המצרית העברית  
כי חיות הנדה בטרם תבוא  
אלהן המילדת וילדו:

20. ויטב אלהים למילדת  
וירב העם ויעצמו מאד:

PHARAONI." Sed et lectionem *paryob* prorsus efflagitat metrum ; quippe quod aliter recto talo stare omnino non potest. Atque hanc insignem emendationem, à Metro depostulatam, plane confirmat Cod. Sam.

68. En versiculum in textu Hebræo & sensu & metro pariter mancum et imperfectum ! Inducitur Pharao suis mandata edens, hoc modo : " Masculum oninem, quicumque natus fuerit, in " fluvium projicite." Papæ ! quid audio ? quid sibi vult Rex Ægyptius ? num ut masculos infantes omnes, suos etiam una cum Hebræis, nullo discrimine, mitterent illico in profluentem ? Egregium vero πομπυονα λανον ! hominem, seu potius belluam, vecordem atque immanem ! Tu vero, si me audis, in librariorum stupidos et somnulentos omnem culpam rejicito. Nos si vocem, quam isti supina negligentia prætermiserunt, in sedem suam postliminio revocamus, ecquid erit pretii ? Ecce ipsam prorsus : לעברים !

col háben hájillód *leyíbrim.*!

Quam,

65. vájehí, ci járeu hámejáldot  
ét haélohím, vajávas láhem báttim.

vajézav párvoh lécol yámmo lémor,  
col háben, hájillód *levíbrim*,  
hajórah tářlicúhu,

70. vecól habát teřájun.

Quam, quod sancte adseverare possum, Metrum ipsum primitus suggestit; tum sensus, Cod. Sam. LXX. Intt. firmaverunt. I nunc, et nega Metricen Hebræam in vera Codicis Hebræi lectione instauranda quicquam proficere!

Sed hæc hætenus, in primum solummodo Exodi Caput: quæ nos levi opera, et planè *αυτοσχεδῶς*, in chartam conjecimus; non cum locum ideo feligentes, quod in eo plura, quam in alio fere  
quovis

21. ויהי כי יראו המילדת  
את האלהים ויעש להם בתים :

22. ויצו פרעה לכל עמו לאמר  
כל הבן הילוד . . .  
היארה תשליכהו  
וכל הבת תחיון :

quovis Pentateuchi capite, ope Metricæ restituere nos et emendare posse consideremus; sed fortuito incidentes, periculi tantum et speciminis causa. Tu autem, Lector, his laboris nostri primitiis utere, fructu; sed totum hoc, quantumcunque est, præclaro Harii reperto acceptum refer, et Genio Metricæ Hebrææ inflauratori, ospitatori, statori, hecatomben litato.

I have now pursued this subject as far as I intended; much further perhaps than it will be thought necessary for me to have done. And, I think, I have shewn, what the Hebrew Metre is not; namely, that it is not Bishop Hare's Metre. But I cannot venture to proceed upon that axiom, on which you, Sir, so very much insist; and to conclude, that, "from ' knowing, negatively, what it is not, we may with great certainty collect, positively, what it is." On the contrary, I find, I must be satisfied with much less sanguine pretensions, and content myself with joining in the humble wish of Cicero: "Utinam tam facile possem vera invenire, quam falsa convincere!"

You may possibly tell me again, that, instead of confuting the Bishop's system, I have made a joke of it, and turned it to ridicule. All the apology which I shall offer upon this occasion, if any be thought needful, is this: that if an object, by being placed in a proper, a just, and a true light, appears ridiculous; he who so placeth it, is not to be blamed; the fault is not in him, but in the object itself.

One word more, Sir, and I have done. It may be expected, that I should give some reason, why I do not answer your Latin Epistle in the same language. The plain truth of

<sup>1</sup> EDWARDS Preliminary Dissertation, p. 18. Prolegom. in Libb. Poeticos, p. 32.

the matter is this : as soon as I had read and considered your Epistle, I sat down to write to you my thoughts more at large upon the subject, merely for your private perusal, with no design of making them public ; being very unwilling to try the patience of my readers any more upon so dry, so unfruitful, and so unedifying an argument. When I had written about half of what you now see, finding it run to such a length, and so far still from drawing to a conclusion, I threw it aside with disgust and indignation ; and determined never to trouble myself any more, or you at all, with it. Almost a year afterwards I happened to light upon my papers : I looked them over, having then quite forgotten the particular contents of them ; and finding what I had written to be clear, as I thought, and conclusive, I was induced to resume my design ; but could not persuade myself to take the trouble of altering the form of it : and I imagined, that it might possibly be of further use than I at first proposed. When an Hypothesis comes strongly recommended under the sanction of a great name ; when it is confidently appealed to as firmly and unquestionably established, and urged as sufficient warrant for introducing, or even confirming, emendations and alterations of the Hebrew Text of the Holy Scriptures ; the matter, however insignificant

in itself, becomes of real importance in its consequences, and merits serious attention, and a strict examination. And when men of learning and genius misapply their labours, and throw away their abilities, in the pursuit of a mere shadow; and by their example and authority draw after them younger students, capable of better things, into the same vain pursuit; to convince them and others of the delusion they are under, is saving useful hands to the public, and doing a general service to the Commonwealth of Letters,

I am,

Reverend S I R,

Your most humble Servant,

Nov. 20,  
1765.

R. LOWTH.

# ERRATA.

P. 17. l. 27. *r.* attempt,

28. 16. *r.* *and hell*, as λιγῆν.



BOOKS printed for A. MILLAR in the Strand,  
and J. DODSLEY in Pall-Mall.

**D**E Sacra Poesi Hebræorum Prælectiones Academicæ,  
Oxonii habitæ a Roberto Lowth, D. D.

Johannis Davidis Michaelis, Philos. Profess. Ord. et  
Societatis Regiæ Scientiarum Goettingensis Collegæ in  
Roberti Lowth Prælectiones de sacra Poesi Hebræorum  
Notæ et Epimetra: ex Goettingensi editione Prælectionum.

The Life of William of Wykeham, Bishop of Win-  
chester, collected from Records, Registers, MSS. and  
other authentic Evidences, by Robert Lowth, D. D.

A short Introduction to English Grammar, with critical  
Notes. Two Editions, one on Writing Paper, price 3s.  
and the other for the Use of Schools, price 1s. 6d.

A Letter to the Right Reverend Author of the Divine  
Legation of Moses demonstrated; in answer to an Ap-  
pendix to the Fifth Volume of that Work: With an Ap-  
pendix, containing a former Literary Correspondence, by a  
late Professor in the University of Oxford, the 4th Edition.









UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY  
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

1977 JUN 9 1977

1977 JUN 9 1977

UCLA Young Research Library

PJ4774 .L95I

yr



L 009 558 765 5

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 001 246 611 6

